

REMARKS

The Official Action of November 1, 2004, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-4 and 7-14, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled and new claims 12-14 added. Claims 1-4 and 7-14 remain in the application for consideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claims 6 and 7 are allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form. In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the features of claim 5 and allowable claim 6, and added new independent claims 12-14 wherein the features of allowed claim 7 are made dependent respectively from claims 2-4.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is now allowable along with dependent claims 2-4 and 7-14, and that this application is now in condition for allowance.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that

Appln. No. 10/796,006
Amdt. dated January 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2004

such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\B\dire\CHANG193\Pto\Amendment-A.doc